

ah



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,336	08/27/2003	Michael Gadd	17087/002001	4679

7590 08/09/2007
ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.
Suite 2800
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, TX 77010

EXAMINER

HAN, QI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/649,336	Applicant(s) GADD ET AL.	
	Examiner Qi Han	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-31 and 63-65 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-62 and 66-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Election/Restrictions

3. This application contains claims 25-31 and 63-65 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 05/17/2006 (also see the amendment filed on 12/20/2006 for claim 31 and the amendment filed on 06/21/2007 for claims 63-65). A complete reply to the final rejection must include **cancellation** (not withdraw) of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Response to Amendment

4. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment dated 06/21/2007. The applicant(s) amended claims 32,38, 41, 47, 53, ,57, 58, 60-62, and added new claims 66-77 (see the amendment: pages 3-11).

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 101, because the applicant amended the corresponding claims.

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd, because the applicant made further explanation/clarification. Based on the applicant's argument, the claimed limitation "in notation independent form" will be interpreted in a broad sense, which can be read on any operable platform or computer-based system.

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st, because the applicant amended the corresponding claims, except claim 49 (see below).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/21/2007 with respect to the claim rejection under 35 USC 102/103, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, since the amended claims introduce new issue and/or change the scope of the claims. Further, it is noted that the arguments are based on the newly amended independent claims (see REMARKS in the amendment: pages 16-20), so that the response to the applicant's arguments is directed to the new claim rejection (see detail below).

Art Unit: 2626

6. In response to applicant's arguments with respect to claim 49 (see REMARKS in the amendment: page 14, paragraph 4) under 35 USC 112 1st, it is noted the applicant's provided evidences (p50 and p100) in the specification do not show the same scope of the previously amended claim because the disclosure of "provision of link conditions that are not mutually exclusive" in the specification (p50) does not mean "the **application managers are mutually interactive**" and the argument of "an activity by a user in one application may result in activity in another application" does not fully cover the scope of "the application managers are **mutually interactive**" either. It is common knowledge that making the application managers "**mutually interactive**" has more requirements and difficulties than just making one application manager active by another manager. Therefore, the applicant failed to provide persuasive evidence/argument to overcome the rejection, and the rejection is sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 49, the limitation "the application managers are mutually interactive such that activity by a user in one application may result in activity in another application" introduces new subject matter, which is not specifically described in the original specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 32, 34-35, 37-49, 52-53, 55-62, 66, 70 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN et al. (US 7,137,126 B1) hereinafter referenced as COFFMAN, in view of THOMPSON et al. (US 2002/78150 A1) hereinafter referenced as THOMPSON.

As per **claim 32**, COFFMAN discloses ‘conversational computing via conversational virtual machine personality (title), providing ‘a universal coordinated multi-modal conversational user interface’ across a plurality of ‘conversational applications’ (abstract), comprising:

“an automatic speech recognition system (ASR) for recognizing speech inputs from a user”, (col. 3, lines 57-67, ‘conversational subsystems (which may be local or distributed) including speech recognition’; also see Fig. 6);

“a speech generation system for providing speech to be delivered to the user”, (col. 3, lines 57-67, ‘conversational subsystems (which may be local or distributed) including ...text-to-speech’; also see Fig. 6);

“a database storing data speech constructs configured to carry out a conversation for use by the automatic speech recognition system and the speech generation system, the data speech constructs comprising prompts and grammars stored in notation independent form”, (col. 15, line 55 to col. 16, line 48, ‘meta-information repository (interpreted as database)’ that collects all the information typically assumed known in a conversation interaction...’, ‘translate input and output to and from the dialog manager 219 to database queries’; col. 22, lines 4-32, ‘the context stack 405’ and ‘data file 413’ (can also be interpreted as database) including ‘vocabulary file, language model, ...tags, voice print (corresponding to prompts), TTS rule, grammar...’

Art Unit: 2626

(corresponding to data speech constructs); Fig.4 show the subsystems are structurally and functionally separated, which is interpreted as independent form as claimed; col. 11, line 11 and col. 12, lines 21, 'user prompt', 'foundation classes (inherently having parameters, values)' including 'Request confirmation (for prompt)');

"a controller for controlling the automatic speech recognition system, the speech generation system and the database", (col. 18, lines 50-55, 'CVM controller'; Fig.4 and col. 22, lines 47-67, 'CVM 401', 'task dispatcher/controller' and 'dialog controller', wherein each of them can be read on claimed controller; col. 15, lines 29-43, 'conversation manager' and 'CPU', each of them can also be read on claimed controller); and

"a voice user interface provided between the user and one or more applications", (Figs 5-6, 'conversational UI' including 'VUI (voice user interface)');

"at least one further interface, the further user interface comprising a non-voice user interface", (Figs 5-6, 'conversational UI' including 'GUI (graphic user interface-- non-voice user interface)');

"wherein the controller is configured to manage synchronous conversations between the user and the computer system across a voice channel provided by the voice user interface and at least one non-voice channel provided by the at least one further user interface", (col. 8, lines 21-63, 'synchronization between a GUI modality and a speech modality'; col. 9, lines 1-15, 'provides a universal coordinated multi-modal conversational user interface (CUI)' for 'various I/O resources such as voice, keyboard, ...touch screen' and 'speech + GUI'; col. 15, lines 29-49, 'managing the dialog (conversational dialog comprising speech and multi modal I/O such as GUI keyboard, pointer, mouse, video input etc)').

COFFMAN does not expressly disclose “an operator interface for allowing an operator to observe a voice session between the user and the computer system”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by THOMPSON who discloses ‘VTE (virtual team environment) server’ and ‘presence server (operator interface)’ for ‘monitoring (observing) the status of each communications devices identified in the user’s current personal profile’ and updating ‘the status table to indicate’ user logged-in/logout’ (observe a voice session between the user and the computer system) (p(agraph)87-p88); and further teaches that ‘the respective GUIs are updated to display the session in the communications session display widow’ and ‘sends status data to the Presence Server to update availability information respecting the voice communications devices in use (p151). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that GUI on server is used for operator(s), and modify ‘CVM platform/system as server’ with ‘GUI’ for operator disclosed by COFFMAN (col. 8, lines 1-60) by providing displaying voice communication session, as taught by THOMPSON, for the purpose (motivation) of monitoring the status of communication devices (THOMPSON: p87).

As per **claim 34** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN in view THOMPSON further discloses “a workflow manager for managing transitions between workflow components stored in the database” (col. 34, lines 36-50, ‘the task (workflow) dispatcher/controller 402 divides each command/process into multiple actions, starts the associated threads/processes with the context stack 405 (interpreted as database)’ and allocates each resource and shares them between spawned actions, and controls handles and streams to the appropriate conversational subsystems...’; col. 34, lines 5-30, ‘the task dispatcher/controller 402’ to ‘handle multiple

Art Unit: 2626

simultaneous tasks' and 'the issue of maintaining the dialog flow'; col. 23, line 46 to col. 24, line 10, 'dialog controller manages the dialog across all the conversational and conventional applications', performing 'function of dialog manager' with 'different tasks' and 'exchanging information between local parallel applications').

As per **claim 35** (depending on claim 34), COFFMAN further discloses:

"a prompt component comprising a dialogue spoken to a user", (col. 10, line 65, 'spoken prompt');

"actions representing an action performed as a consequence of user dialogue", (col. 21, lines 41-44, 'converting conversational and conventional input streams into multiple actions ...'; col. 30, lines 7-10, 'spawn multiple actions' including executing task...');

"parameters comprising information to be elicited from a user", (col. 4, lines 11-12, 'query arguments (parameters)'; col. 22, lines 10-15);

"words comprising possible values for parameters", (col. 22, lines 10-15, 'arguments list of attribute value n-(t)uples'; col. 39, lines 44-46, 'arguments of function calls with the sequence of words...'); and

"phrases comprising a set of related prompts and possible user responses", (col. 16, lines 7-11, 'dialog prompts (introduction, questions, feedback etc)'; col. 31, lines 2-7, 'generate a request (a prompt) for missing or ambiguous information and update the context (requested missing fields', which implies user responses as claimed).

As per **claim 37** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "the database stores mappings between keywords and system functionality" (col. 9, lines 39-60, 'the conventional applications 12 are managed by the CVM kernel layer 14...for accessing

Art Unit: 2626

commands (corresponding to keywords) of the conventional applications as well as the underlying OS commands', 'converting (mapping) voice requests into queries and converting output and results into spoken messages using the appropriated data files 17 (e.g. contexts, finite state grammars, vocabularies, ...symbolic query maps (mappings) etc.)' (corresponding to database); also see col. 17, lines 61-67 and col. 31, lines 53-67).

As per **claim 38** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "the database stores statistical information automatically adapting automatic speech recognition system probability profiles" (col. 22, lines 39-60, 'HMM (hidden markov models)', which necessarily and/or inherently includes the claimed feature).

As per **claim 39** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "automatically generates a spoken language interface personality based on user demographics" (col. 35, lines 16-22, 'conversational customization', 'the personality/behavior of the CVM can be automatically customized to an identified user's preferences'; also see Figs. 1 and 4, blocks 17 and 413 and col. 13, lines 60-67).

As per **claim 40** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "a hybrid rule based and stochastic natural language processing engine configured to automatically recognize user responses or dynamically generate system prompts based on conversational context" (col. 22, lines 4-32, 'the context stacks', 'performing their respect tasks such as ...HMM (hidden markov models ---stochastic/statistic processing), language models, TTS rules, grammar (rule based processing)...', which is read on the claim).

As per **claim 41** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "constructs and user utterances for which the automatic speech recognition system listens, wherein the data

Art Unit: 2626

speech constructs are stored in notation independent form” (col. 22, lines 39-60, ‘vocabulary, HMM (hidden markov models), voiceprint (user utterance), language models or possible queries for a speech input, which necessarily and/or inherently includes the claimed feature; col. 3, line 35-40, ‘CVM’ is implemented either as stand-alone OS, or as a platform or kernel that runs on top of a conventional OS or RTOS...’ reads on in notation independent form).

As per **claim 42** (depending on claim 41), COFFMAN further discloses “prompts or recorded voice delivered by the automatic speech generator to the user” (col. 18, lines 50-64, ‘voice prints’, ‘baseforms and voice fonts’, ‘TTS’).

As per **claim 43** (depending on claim 41), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 34, because the rejection for claim 34 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 43.

As per **claim 44** (depending on claim 32), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 39, because the rejection for claim 39 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 44, wherein ‘conversational customization’ and ‘the personality/behavior’ are read on claimed user profile.

As per **claim 45** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “an adaptive learning unit, the adaptive learning unit being responsive to historical transactions between the spoken language interface and a given user to automatically customize the dialogue with the given user” (col. 16, lines 18-48, ‘global history 216...stores...information that associated with all the applications and actions taking during a conversational session’; col. 30, ‘content stack can be traversed...finding and selecting the active discourses between the user and machine among the last and past discourses, possible going back into the history’; col. 36, lines 5-20,

Art Unit: 2626

‘dialogs, categories, meta-information, and access to resources can be a function of the identify of the user and its associated meta-information history’; col. 49, lines 36-39, ‘the user meta-information is one of the provided directed by the user, learned (adaptive learning) from past usage of the system by the user, and combination thereof’).

As per **claim 46** (depending on claim 44), COFFMAN further discloses “the personalization unit is connected between the database and the controller” (Figs. 1 and 4, blocks 17 and 14, 413 and 414).

As per **claim 47** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “updating the data speech constructs, wherein the means for updating operates while automatic speech recognition system operates” (col. 31, lines 65-67, ‘the context stack (including data speech constructs) is updated pending on (while operating) voice, keyboard, mouse or any other input or command and on the application output’ (necessarily including operation of speech recognition); col. 36, lines 10-12, ‘the meta-information (including data speech constructs) ... can be ... updated before and after each action ore access’; col. 38, lines 2-7, ‘in particular dialog structures, each system can ... update the skeleton meta-information’).

As per **claim 48** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “interfaces to a plurality of applications, providing the user with voice access to each application, and an application manager for each application, wherein each application manager comprises an internal representation of the application” (Fig. 6, showing multi-modal (multiple interfaces) and the corresponding repetitions; and col. 20, lines 8-67, ‘different dialog managers’ and ‘different applications will have their own dialog manager’).

As per **claim 49** (depending on claim 48), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st (see above), COFFMAN further discloses “mutually interactive such that activity by a user in one application may result in activity in another application” (Fig. 6 and col. 20, lines 8-67, ‘information exchange (interactive activity) between dialog managers’, ‘the different dialog managers will negotiate a topology with a master dialog manager and slave or peer dialog managers’).

As per **claim 52** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “a notification manager for notifying the user of preselected events” (col. 20, lines 8-67, ‘information exchange’ including ‘notification of I/O events... ‘notification of recognition events...’, wherein the mechanism handling the notifications is read on notification manager).

As per **claim 53** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “a location manager for determining a location of the user and for modifying data provided to the user in accordance with the location” (col. 42, lines 33-39, ‘guide you turn by turn to the store’, ‘you position is computed, location of the store is fetched’ and ‘an itinerary is computed (implying modifying data) to take into account the latest traffic information’, wherein the mechanism handling the location/itinerary is read on location manager).

As per **claim 55** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “the voice channel and the at least one non-voice channel are provided by one device.” (Figs. 6-7 and 12, blocks 708-710).

As per **claim 56** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses “the voice channel and the at least one non-voice channel are provided by different devices” (Figs. 6-7 and 12, blocks 600-603).

As per **claim 57**, it recites a method of handling dialogues. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 32, because the rejection for claim 32 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 57.

As per **claim 58** (depending on claim 57), COFFMAN further discloses “prior to marking a phrase as complete, prompting the user to confirm details given to the automatic voice recognition system” (col. 31, lines 50-60, ‘if the request (including phrase) is complete, it will be executed, pending possible request for confirmation by the user...’, which is read on the claim).

As per **claim 59** (depending on claim 58), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON does not expressly disclose “when the user does not confirm the details in the affirmative, asking the user to select a desired parameter value, resetting the desired parameter value to empty; and playing a prompt to elicit a value from the user for the empty parameter values”. However, COFFMAN discloses that ‘if the user rejects... his/her input prior to execution or notification of execution to the user, the input is appended to the active utterances and the search is re-started’ (not confirm the details in the affirmative) and the system can ‘generate a request (a prompt) for the missing or ambiguous information and update the context’ (col. 31, lines 1-7 and 50-67); providing a universal coordinated multi-modal conversational user interface (CUI) with ‘speech+GUI’ (col. 9, lines 1-15); using ‘conversational foundation classes’, ‘dialog objects’ and ‘conversational gesture messages’ that is ‘rendered as a displayed string or spoken prompt’ with ‘CML (conversational markup language)’ (col. 10, lines 35-67); ‘examples of some conversational foundation classes’ include ‘Request_confirmation... Correct-input... Listen_to_TTS... Listen_to_playback’ (col. 11, line 23 to col. 12, line 67); ‘voice input... can be arguments (parameters) of function calls’ and the results ‘derived classes in a object-oriented context’ (col.

Art Unit: 2626

39, lines 43-49); and the conversational example with CUI and PDA (col. 42, lines 1-39), which suggests that the system has capability of implementing the functionality as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that receiving new input would initiate a new object (or function call) that necessarily resets/initiates corresponding variable(s) (parameter value being empty) and assigning the variable(s) for the new input data, and to combine the different teachings from COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON by providing further conversational dialog actions for receiving new input data and prompting the corresponding information, as suggested by COFFMAN, for the purpose (motivation) of using the conversational user interface for system dialog with user to complete, disambiguate, summarize or correct queries and the result of the executions (COFFMAN: col. 15-19).

As per **claim 60**, it recites a computer readable medium. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 57, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 57.

As per **claim 61** (depending on claim 60), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 58, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 58.

As per **claim 62** (depending on claim 61), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 59, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 59.

As per **claim 66** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON further discloses "to allow the operator to observe information **comprising at least one** selected from the group consisting of: an identity of the user; an utterance of the user; tasks currently

Art Unit: 2626

running; and a stage of a currently running task”, (THOMPSON: Fig. 2, block 34 ‘Status Table’).

As per **claim 70** (depending on claim 57), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 66, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 66.

As per **claim 74** (depending on claim 60), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 66, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 66.

9. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON as applied to claim 32, and further in view of MAES (US 6,970, 935 B1).

As per **claim 33** (depending on claim 32), even though COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON discloses that “the at least one non-voice interface comprises a World Wide Web (www) interface” (COFFMAN: col. 37, lines 40-50, ‘web browsing’ through ‘conventional browser (corresponding to www interface) modality’ to ‘display the information’, COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON does not expressly disclose “a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) interface”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by MAES who discloses ‘conversational networking via transport, cording and control conversational protocols’ (title), comprising ‘the conversational protocols’ that may be implemented on top to HTTP’ or ‘WAP (wireless application protocol)’ (col. 6, lines 56-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON by providing a conversational protocols including WAP, as taught by MAES, for the purpose (motivation) of providing equivalent lightweight transport protocol to use on wireless networks (MAES: col. 6, lines 65-66).

10. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON as applied to claim 35, and further in view of TESSEL et al. (US 7,016,847 B1) hereinafter referenced as TESSEL.

As per **claim 36** (depending on claim 35), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON does not expressly disclose whether the prompt can be “static” or “dynamic”, or both. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by TESSEL who discloses ‘open architecture for a voice user interface’ (title), and teaches that ‘a prompt can be static, or it can be news stories or other audio data that was recorded dynamically’ and ‘both types of prompts... can be played directly’ (col. 12, lines 5-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON by providing capability of playing both static and dynamic prompts, as taught by TESSEL, for the purpose (motivation) of providing prompts in different situations, such as the data being variable and the data being stored as built-in (TESSEL: col. 12, lines 15-18).

11. Claims 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON as applied to claim 32, and further in view of KUO et al. (US 6,418,440 B1) hereinafter referenced as KUO.

As per **claim 50** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON further discloses “a session manager connected to the controller for managing user sessions” (COFFMAN: col. 16, lines 49-67, ‘the CVM system’ comprising using ‘conversational protocols 204’ and ‘the communication stack 214’ that is ‘implemented by connection with the well-

Art Unit: 2626

known OSI protocol layers', including a session layer', which necessarily and/or inherently have a mechanism for managing user sessions as claimed), but does not expressly disclose "the session manager being arranged to monitor a user conversation, whereby if a break in that conversation occurs, the user can be reconnected at the same point in the conversation".

However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by KUO who discloses system and method for performing automated dynamic dialogue generation (title), comprising 'dialog manager' monitoring the dialog (conversation) and user behavior and 'profile manager' monitoring 'subsequent dialogue sessions' (col. 5, lines 4-43); 'dialogue manager' to 'control the dialogue flow' and 'log system and dialogue information' to 'trace dialogue sessions' (col. 10, lines 19-24); col. 10, lines 48-55, functioning 'dialogue history, and keeping a log of dialogue sessions', and 'go back (reconnect) to a previous part (at the same point in the conversation) of the session' (col. 10, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON by specifically providing a mechanism for monitoring dialog sessions and handling to go back to a previous part of the session, as taught by KUO, for the purpose (motivation) of being more efficient and more readily for modifying user's application and updating requested services and information (KUO: col. 5, lines 55-57).

As per **claim 51** (depending on claim 50), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON and KUO further discloses "the break in the user conversation occurs due to an event selected from one of a loss in a connection and a switch of application by the user" (COFFMAN; col. 20, lines 25-49, 'information can be exchanged... interrupted (break in the user conversation occurs) action (event)'; KUO: col. 10, lines 53-55, 'the dialog becomes stuck (corresponding break)').

12. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON as applied to claim 32, and further in view of PETRECCA et al. (US 5,781,894) hereinafter referenced as PETRECCA.

As per **claim 54** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON does not expressly disclose “an advertising manager for, at the choice of the user, selectively displaying advertisements to the user in accordance with one or more predetermined parameters”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by PETRECCA who discloses ‘method and system for advertising on personal computer’ (title), comprising ‘advertising messages’ being displayed and ‘an activating system’ that ‘gives the consumer (user) the choice to (selectively) view the advertisements’ (col. 1, lines 43-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON by specifically providing a mechanism of handling and displaying advertisements, as taught by PETRECCA, for the purpose (motivation) of enabling sponsors to present advertisements or commercials to a user when using computer (PETRECCA: abstract).

13. Claims 67-69, 71-73 and 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON as applied to claims 32, 57 and 60, and further in view of FELKEY et al. (US 5,781,894) hereinafter referenced as FELKEY.

As per **claim 67** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON does not expressly disclose “to allow the operator to control the voice session between the user and the

Art Unit: 2626

computer system”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by FELKEY who discloses that ‘customer service personnel 314 and/or swivel chair operator may access the telecommunications (voice session) service procurement system... via a back office graphical user interface (GUI) running on the devices ...in order to procure (control) products and/or services for the customers’, providing ‘customer service functions’ (p38) and ‘performed as ‘the service coordinator’ (between user and system)(p45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON by providing customer service functions and/or service coordinator for telecommunication product/service using GUI, as taught by FELKEY, for the purpose (motivation) of procuring telecommunication for customers (FELKEY: p38).

As per **claim 68** (depending on claim 67), COFFMAN in view of THOMPSON and FELKEY further discloses “to allow the operator to ... notify the user of a corrective action; or take a corrective action” (FELKEY: p79-p82, ‘questions and help assistance’ and ‘to perform a requested with customer support team (operator)’ (it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that questions and help assistance and customer support would include instructions or suggestions of how to correctly use/perform the system functionality, which broadly reads on the claimed “notify the user of a corrective action”, and ‘a back office administrator (also interpreted as operator) may reset same (customer’s password)’ and ‘gives a different level of access or permission’ (broadly interpreted as take a corrective action)).

As per **claim 69** (depending on claim 32), the rejection is based on the same reason used for claim 68, because it also read on the limitation of claim 69, wherein the ‘help assistance’ and

Art Unit: 2626

'customer support' disclosed by FELKEY (p79-p82) is interpreted as the claimed "to patch the user".

As per **claims 71-73** (depending on claim 57), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 67-69 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 67-69 respectively.

As per **claims 75-77** (depending on claim 60), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 67-69 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 67-69 respectively.

Conclusion

14. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If

Art Unit: 2626

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
August 5, 2007


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER